

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME L. GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN ERIKSON, et al.,

Defendants.

No. C 16-80046M CW

ORDER RETURNING  
COMPLAINT TO  
PLAINTIFF

On December 9, 2005, this Court entered a pre-filing order regarding the cases filed by Plaintiff Jerome Grimes. The pre-filing order states that if Mr. Grimes files a complaint that is "related to any of the following matters:

(1) a diversified group of individuals who commit acts of terror against Mr. Grimes, his family and other citizens;

(2) an injunction against the defendants to prevent them from kidnaping, framing, falsely imprisoning or otherwise terrorizing Mr. Grimes, his family, and other citizens;

(3) a court order for the defendants to be subjected to a lie detector test;

(4) covert terrorism

it will not be filed unless it presents cognizable claims that are not based on merely conclusory allegations. Second, no other complaints filed by Mr. Grimes while he is not incarcerated or detained will be filed unless they contain intelligible factual allegations and claims for relief."

The Court has reviewed the above-captioned complaint filed by Mr. Grimes and finds that it shall not be filed because it alleges

1 that Defendants are engaged in terrorism. Mr. Grimes alleges no  
2 cognizable causes of action in this complaint.

3 Because the above-captioned complaint concerns multiple  
4 matters mentioned in the pre-filing order and presents no  
5 cognizable cause of action, the Clerk of the Court is ordered not  
6 to file it.<sup>1</sup> Instead, the complaint shall be returned to Mr.  
7 Grimes.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9  
10 Dated: March 9, 2016



CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 <sup>1</sup> The Court also notes that at least one page of the  
26 complaint contains a caption for the United States District Court  
27 for the Middle District of Florida and the complaint appears to be  
28 based on events that took place in Florida. Accordingly, it is  
not clear that this Court is the appropriate venue for any claims  
arising out of these events.